Case 2:99-cr-00072-DBH Document 44 Filed 11/13/13 Page 1 of 20 Page 1 #: 1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF MAINE 3 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CRIMINAL ACTION) Docket No. 99-72-P-H 5 6 v. 7 CHARLES HALL, Defendant. 8 9 10 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 11 Pursuant to notice, the above-entitled matter came on for Sentencing Hearing before the HON. D. BROCK HORNBY, in 12 13 the United States District Court, Portland, Maine, on the 14 17th day of January, 2001, at 3:22 p.m. 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the Government: John Van Lonkhuyzen, Esquire 20 For the Defendant: Bruce Merrill, Esquire 21 22 23 Cindy Packard, RMR Official Court Reporter 24 25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript

produced by computer.

1 (At 3:22 p.m., defendant present in open court with his counsel, the following proceedings transpired.) 2 THE COURT: This is Criminal Number 99-72-P-H, 3 United States v. Charles M. Hall. The matter is on this 4 5 afternoon for sentencing. Mr. Merrill, would you and Mr. Hall please stand. 6 7 Mr. Hall, the purpose of the hearing this afternoon is for me to sentence you, but before I do that, I'm going to 8 hear from your lawyer. I'll hear from the prosecutor. I'll 9 10 hear from you, if you want to speak to me. I'm going to start by asking some questions of you and 11 12 your lawyer because I need to be sure that you have read and 13 discussed with him the presentence report in this matter 14 before I can impose sentence. 15 First of all, Mr. Merrill, have you read and discussed with Mr. Hall the presentence report? 16 17 MR. MERRILL: Yes, I have, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Did you have enough time to do that? 19 MR. MERRILL: Yes, I did. Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Hall, the presentence report tells 21 me in Paragraph 47 the medications that you are taking. I think Mr. Merrill is going to turn to that paragraph so you 22 can see the list there. What I want to ask you, are you 23 still taking those medications? 24

MR. HALL: Some of them, Your Honor.

25

1 THE COURT: Some of them. Which ones are you no 2 longer taking? MR. HALL: I'm no longer on the folic acid, the 3 4 Carafate, the Tagamet or the Imodium. I'm on Pentasa and 5 prednisone. 6 THE COURT: Are you taking those in the prescribed 7 amounts? 8 MR. HALL: Yes, I am. THE COURT: Are there any new medications that 9 10 you're taking? 11 MR. HALL: An iron pill daily and a multivitamin. 12 That's it. THE COURT: All right. Aside then from those 13 14 medications we've just talked about, have you used any other 15 drugs or alcohol in the last 24 hours? 16 MR. HALL: No, I have not. 17 THE COURT: Have you read and discussed the 18 presentence report with your lawyer? 19 MR. HALL: Yes, I have. 20 THE COURT: Did you have enough time to do that? 21 MR. HALL: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Then you can 23 be seated. I'll hear from the lawyers. I'll hear from the prosecution first, Mr. Van Lonkhuyzen. 24 25 MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: Your Honor, thank you. Your

Honor, the defendant -- the government moves that the defendant be sentenced in accord with the plea. He pled guilty to Count Six of mailing an extortionate letter in violation of 18 USC, Section 876, Paragraph 2.

The letter to which he pled guilty was one of a series addressed to U.S. Attorney McCloskey and others. In that particular letter, he threatened to kill the U.S. Attorney or a member of his family unless the defendant was paid \$1 million and all criminal charges against him were dropped.

The plea agreement is pursuant to Rule 11(e)(1)(C) and has a 151-month appropriate disposition recommended, which was accepted by this court.

The government believes that that 151-month sentence is an appropriate disposition. First, the defendant is a career offender within the meaning of the guidelines, and the offense to which he pled guilty has a 20-year statutory maximum.

Thus, 151 months is the low end of the guideline range, assuming that the defendant gets three points for acceptance.

Second, the sentence to be imposed here is greater than the statutory maximum for violations of 844(e), making a bomb threat by telephone, three of which were charged against the defendant and which arguably are the most

serious of his conduct.

And third, with the defendant's prior sentences, both state and federal, this sentence should keep him in prison for approximately 20 years. He will have approximately 16 years of federal time to do after he completes his state sentence.

Therefore, we believe this is an appropriate disposition to be imposed.

I have one minor correction to the presentence report, which I'd ask the court to adopt. Stacy Walker and Paula O'Brien are listed in Paragraph 8 regarding victim impact as two people who received threatening telephone calls.

The people who actually received the threatening telephone calls were Adrienne Brown and David Brown of the ATF, Kelley Spardella, a supervisor at the Portland Jetport air traffic control tower, and Kim Stewart and Mike Megalski for the call to the Secret Service.

Stacy Walker and Paula O'Brien actually were employees of the U.S. Attorney's Office at that time. Stacy was a student clerk. And they, among other things, opened some of the threatening letters with which defendant was charged and that's how they became victims.

THE COURT: So the correction you're asking is to --

MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: Is that Stacy Walker and

Paula O'Brien be listed as persons receiving -- opening threatening letters rather than receiving threatening phone calls.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: Further, the government urges the court to find in its findings of fact that the defendant did make the three telephone bomb threats on December 1st, 1998; June 19, 1999; and June 20, 1999, as set out in Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the presentence report.

The defendant admitted in his plea agreement that the government's evidence would have proved these three calls if they went -- if we had gone to trial and that they were, if proven, relevant conduct.

Second, they are relevant conduct under the guidelines and as the PSI concludes, they were substantiated as the report says in the response to the defendant's objection.

They are also related in that the U.S. Attorney's Office was investigating the first telephone bomb threat, which led to the defendant writing his series of 13 letters, including the one that he pled guilty here to today, the first letters inquired about the status of that investigation. They went on to solicit the murder of Mr. McCloskey and then to threaten Mr. McCloskey and demand that the investigation be dropped.

Second, the defendant engaged in the first of these

three threatening phone calls while he was being held for sentencing by this court on his prior federal case. And after -- the second two were made after he refused to give handwriting exemplars and was held in contempt by this court on the investigation leading to this case.

This is repeated conduct by the defendant while he has been incarcerated in a maximum security unit. And the government believes it important to find these so that the Bureau of Prisons will have a basis found in fact in the presentence report and the sentence to take whatever measures BOP deems appropriate to prevent this kind of harm happening in the future.

For example, the effects of this included closing down -- these three calls included closing the airport twice here in Portland. Five flights were diverted. More flights were delayed.

One City Center was evacuated. There were numerous searches. And in one instance, a bomb dog was called in from the Brunswick Naval Air Station.

The defendant has repeatedly threatened law enforcement and government officers, former President Bush at Walker's Point, another Judge of this court and the U.S. Attorney.

We request that the court make a finding or adopt the PSI that the defendant did make these three phone calls and that in the judgment, the court indicate that BOP consider

Thank you.

these phone calls and as well as the conviction for the threatening letter in determining what measures are appropriate to monitor and/or restrict or limit defendant's mail and telephone privileges while he is in BOP custody.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Van Lonkhuyzen.
Mr. Merrill, for the defendant.

MR. MERRILL: Your Honor, if I could, on the ministerial matter first. In Paragraph 8, we would request that the reference to Special Agent Mike Megalski as being a victim of any of the telephone calls, that Mike Megalski be stricken.

He was a special agent. He was at home at the time. A call was routed to him, but I do not believe he would qualify in the legal sense as being a victim. And I would ask that his name be stricken from Paragraph 8 of the presentence report.

More importantly, and more of a matter of substance and important to Mr. Hall is the fact that he entered into a plea agreement to plead guilty to Count Six of the indictment, which charged him with mailing a threatening communication, extortionate communication.

He entered into that plea and made very clear that we were not admitting to any of the other conduct in the indictment. And, in fact, Paragraph 7 of the plea agreement

in the second sentence says the defendant and the United States agree that the three telephone bomb threats described in the statement of facts which is attached would be, if proven, relevant offense conduct within the meaning of the sentencing guidelines.

And it has always been our position that yes, if it was proven, that would be relevant conduct. We were not concerned about that because that is not the offense of conviction which brings us before the court today.

The offense of conviction is mailing a threatening communication, which Mr. Hall has admitted to. And I do not believe that it is necessary or proper for this court to resolve that issue as to whether or not Mr. Hall, in fact, made the three telephone bomb threats that were charged in that indictment. He objects to that.

The presentence report reflects each of Paragraphs 5 through 8 and 10, that the defendant is not admitting the conduct described in those paragraphs.

We have no objection based upon the plea to Count Six to writing a threatening communication if the government wants to advise the Bureau of Prisons that they should somehow monitor Mr. Hall's mail based upon the offense of conviction, we cannot argue with that.

But we can and do argue against the necessity of this court making a finding that Mr. Hall made any of the

telephone counts charged in the indictment. That is not what he pled guilty to. And while we do not contest that if proven, it would constitute relevant conduct, we didn't have a trial on that. We didn't admit to those.

There have been no factual findings made regarding whether or not Mr. Hall made those telephone calls. And we would object and believe it is not necessary for this court to resolve those issues in order to sentence Mr. Hall today.

The presentence report is obviously going to follow him to the Bureau of Prisons. And that's why I asked that the language be put in there indicating that he does not admit to those charges, but I do not believe that this court's imprimatur should be placed upon that when there have been no factual findings to suggest that Mr. Hall, in fact, did make those calls. And that is our major contention and objection to the presentence report in this regard.

Other than that, this is an 11(e)(1)(C) plea as Mr. Van Lonkhuyzen has indicated, has been accepted by the court.

We do not object to the other calculations as far as guideline calculations that Mr. Hall is a career offender under the guidelines, that his sentence is going to be 151 months. We understand that.

We understand that it's going to be consecutive to the 43-month sentence imposed by this court in December of 1998, which is consecutive to the state court sentence which

Mr. Hall is presently serving and in all likelihood will not expire until the year 2004.

So we believe that the sentence that is going to be imposed more than adequately punishes Mr. Hall for the incident offense to which he's pled guilty, which is mailing a threatening communication.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Merrill.

Mr. Hall, as a defendant before me for sentencing, you have the right to speak to me. You can tell me anything you want me to know, particularly anything that might lead me to be more lenient with you, although I do point out as your lawyer has that you've entered into a binding plea agreement. This is your opportunity to tell me anything you want me to know.

MR. HALL: I don't have anything further to add than what my attorney already said, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can be seated. Anything further from the government?

MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: No.

THE COURT: Thank you. Well, I have previously read the presentence report. And now that I've heard from the lawyers and from Mr. Hall, I'll make my findings of fact and conclusions of law and impose sentence. I have previously accepted the binding plea agreement in this matter. And at this time, I will make the guideline

findings.

First of all, I find the facts as set forth in the presentence report with these modifications. First, in Paragraph 8, Stacy Walker and Paula O'Brien were not the recipients of threatening telephone calls, but rather they are people who opened threatening letters.

Also in Paragraph 8, Secret Service Agent Mike Megalski should not be treated as a victim.

I do over the defendant's objection find the facts as set out in Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. He has not conceded to those, I understand that. He has not admitted to them, but I do find them as facts for purposes of this proceeding.

The base offense level under the guidelines is 18 under 2B3.2. Two levels are added for the death threat. Four levels are added for the million dollar demand. Three levels are added because the victim was a government officer. Two levels are added for refusing to provide exemplars to the Grand Jury.

All of that would result in an adjusted offense level of 29. But because Mr. Hall is a career offender, under Guideline 4B1.1, the offense level is 32. He does get a three level reduction for accepting responsibility. Total offense level is therefore 29.

His criminal history is Category VI. The guideline prison range is 151 to 188 months. He is not eligible for

probation. Supervised release is two to three years. He's not able to pay any fine. No departure has been requested. Restitution is not an issue.

Aside from the objections you've raised previously, are there any errors or omissions in the guideline findings, first, for the government?

MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defense.

MR. MERRILL: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hall, this is serious stuff that you're involved in as you well know from the sentence that you're confronting. I don't know why you do this. I'm not sure that you know why you do it. The sentence here is severe and appropriately severe because this has a tremendous impact, what you've done in terms of society, in terms of the fear that it generates in other people, in terms of the effect it has on ordinary activities, whether they're governmental activities or simply private activities at an airport.

You obviously know already from your lawyer what the sentence is going to be here because it's been agreed to.

And that's what I'm going to impose. I urge you to seek whatever kind of counseling you can in the prison system so that this comes to an end. You have a lot of years ahead of you in prison, you know that. But there will come a time if

your health permits it when it will be over and you'll be out. And so you certainly don't want to have these same kinds of issues confronting you and dogging you when you reach that stage.

At this time, the defendant will stand for sentencing.

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 151 months to be served consecutively to the defendant's prior federal sentence under District of Maine Docket Number 98-54-P-H.

It is my understanding as the sentencing Judge, and the United States and the defendant have agreed, that no time from June 10, 1999, to the date of today's date, the sentencing in this case, will be counted toward either federal sentence if such time is being counted by the State of Maine toward the defendant's current state sentence.

I also bring to the attention of the Bureau of Prisons the telephone bomb threats and the mail threats, M-A-I-L, that are set forth in the presentence report, the serious threats that the recommendation that the Bureau of Prisons take appropriate measure to insure that these do not continue, particularly since previous incidents have occurred while Mr. Hall is in custody.

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.

Upon his release from prison, he shall be on supervised 1 release for a term of three years. 2 He shall report to the probation office in the district 3 to which he is released within 72 hours of his release. 4 5 He shall not commit another federal, state or local 6 crime. He shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. 7 He shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled 8 substance. 9 He shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of his 10 release from prison, and at least two periodic drug tests 11 12 thereafter as directed by the probation officer. 13 He shall not possess a firearm. 14 He shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court and the following additional 15 16 conditions: 17 Specifically, he shall submit to testing for use of drugs and intoxicants upon the demand of the supervising 18 19 officer. Criminal monetary penalties are the special assessment 20 21 of \$100. I find that he does not have the ability to pay any 22 fine. I therefore waive fines in this case, but for the 23 special assessment. 24

The payment of the special assessment is due and

25

payable in full immediately.

Now, Mr. Hall, you've entered into a plea agreement that waives your right to appeal this sentence. Such a waiver is generally enforceable.

If you believe your waiver is for some reason unenforceable, you can present that argument to the Court of Appeals. The only way you can do that is by filing a notice of appeal with the clerk of this court within 10 days from today. If you fail to do that, you will lose whatever other rights of appeal you might have.

If you think that for some reason that your waiver is unenforceable, and you want to file that notice and cannot get your lawyer to do it, you can ask that the clerk of this court file the notice, and the clerk will do it, but it has to be within the 10 days.

And if you like, you can ask right now orally here in open court for the clerk to do that, and the clerk will do it.

And if for some reason your waiver is unenforceable, and you cannot afford to prepay the costs of taking the appeal, you can request permission to proceed without prepaying costs. And if you qualify financially, you'll be permitted to do that. Do you understand what I've told you?

MR. HALL: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Merrill, from

the defendant?

MR. MERRILL: Yes, Your Honor. I would ask that a copy of this sentencing transcript be appended to the presentence report so that Mr. Hall's objections to the telephone bomb threats will be clear on the record.

And secondly, due to Mr. Hall's medical condition, as the court's aware, he had an ileostomy surgery recently. He has an ileostomy bag that he wears now. That appliance requires him to daily change it and change some of the bandages associated with that.

And I would ask that when the time comes for him to go to a federal facility that he be designated to a federal medical facility so he'll be able to deal with his medical condition.

THE COURT: Let me deal with those. Does the government take a position on either of those?

MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: No objection to the first.

And as to the second, the government recommends that it be left to the BOP's discretion.

THE COURT: On the first, I do have attached to the presentence report as a matter of course the findings that I make. And I will be clear with the court reporter that those findings state that the findings are over the objection as to those paragraphs, that the defendant does not admit to those.

Case 2:99-cr-00072-DBH Document 44 Filed 11/13/13 Page 18 of 20 Pagel 4: 18

When she reviews the transcript, if that's not there, I
hereby instruct the court reporter to add the sentences that
I've just announced, that those findings are made over the
objection of the defendant.
MR. MERRILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: With respect to the second request, I
will add in the recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons that
they pay careful attention to the medical condition of
Mr. Hall that are set out in the presentence report and take
that into account in making an assignment to the appropriate
location.
MR. MERRILL: Thank you. One moment, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything further?
MR. MERRILL: Nothing else, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything further from the government?
MR. VAN LONKHUYZEN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you both, counsel, for your
performance. Court will stand adjourned.
(At 3:47 p.m., the foregoing proceedings were concluded.)

This document was created with Win2PDF available at http://www.win2pdf.com. The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only. This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.